

REMARKS

Claims 2-21, 38-44, 60-63, 65-69, and 71-98 are pending, with claims 60, 77, 81, 84, and 89 being independent. Claims 1, 22-37, 45-59, 64, and 70 were previously canceled, claims 81 and 85 have been amended, and claims 90-98 have been added. No new subject matter has been introduced.

Interview Summary

Applicants thank Examiner Walsh for the courtesies extended to applicants' representative, Hussein Akhavannik, during the telephonic interview conducted on February 25, 2009. During the interview, the 35 U.S.C. § 101 rejection of independent claim 81 and the objection to the drawings were discussed. A summary of the interview is incorporated into the remarks below.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants acknowledge with appreciation the Examiner's indication that claims 2-21, 38-44, 60-63, 65-69, 71-80, and 82-89 are allowed.

Information Disclosure Statement

Applicants note that applicants filed an Information Disclosure Statement and Form PTO-1449 on October 17, 2008. In the Form PTO-1449 filed October 17, 2008, the citations for Desig. ID "AEE" and Desig. ID "AHH" did not include a publication month. Accordingly, applicants are including a supplemental Information Disclosure Statement and corrected Form PTO-1449 with this Reply to add the April publication month. Accordingly, applicants

respectfully request that the Examiner return a copy of this corrected Form PTO-1449 with the Examiner's initials indicating that references designated "AEE" and Desig. ID "AHH" were considered.

Specification

The specification has been objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for a "tangible computer-readable medium," as previously recited in claim 81. A "tangible computer-readable medium" has been deleted from claim 81, which obviates this objection.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claim 81 has been rejected for being directed to non-statutory subject matter as being drawn to a "tangible computer-readable medium." Without conceding the propriety of this rejection but rather for the purposes of advancing prosecution, applicants have amended independent claim 81 to replace the recited "tangible computer-readable medium" with a "hardware device," which is contrasted from a software device at, for example, page 13, lines 28-30 of the application. Accordingly, in view of the amendment to independent claim 81, applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 81.

Drawings

The drawings have been objected to as not showing an online context being one or more of a web site currently accessed by the user, an Internet domain currently accessed by the user, a newsgroup currently accessed by the user, a message board currently accessed by the user, or a URL currently accessed by the user, as recited in the claims. As discussed during the interview,

applicants note that FIG. 1 shows a context determination service 125, FIG. 2 shows the act 205 of determining an online context of a user, and FIG. 7 shows the act 705 of monitoring online activity of other individuals. The application, on page 3, lines 9-17, states that the context determination service 125 is configured to determine the online context 115 of the user 105, and that the online context 115 may be based upon "a presence of the user 105 at a particular URL (uniform resource locator), chat-room, message board, or newsgroup." The application, on page 5, lines 16-17, also states that the context determination service 125 can perform the act 205. Therefore, applicants respectfully submit that the drawings show the recited online context. Accordingly, applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of this objection to the drawings.

New Claims

Each of new claims 90-98 depends from one of allowed independent claims 84 and 89. At least for the reason of that dependency, applicants respectfully submit that new claims 90-98 are also allowable.

Conclusion

Applicants submit that all claims are in condition for allowance.

It is believed that all of the pending issues have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims)

Applicant : Barry Appelman, et al.
Serial No. : 10/715,211
Filed : November 18, 2003
Page : 22 of 22

Attorney's Docket No.: 06975-0455001

that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this reply should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this reply, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

The excess claims fee of \$468 is being paid concurrently herewith on the Electronic Filing System (EFS) by way of Deposit Account authorization. Please apply any other charges or credits due in connection with this filing or otherwise to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: March 2, 2009

/Hussein Akhavannik/
Hussein Akhavannik
Reg. No. 59,347

Customer No. 26171
Fish & Richardson P.C.
Telephone: (202) 783-5070
Facsimile: (202) 783-2331